

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by AGGARWAL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,614); and rejects claims 10-12 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AGGARWAL et al. in view of MIKI et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,662). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.¹

At the outset, Applicants note that Applicants canceled claims 1, 4, and 5 without prejudice or disclaimer in Applicants' response filed May 30, 2006. Applicants canceled claims 1, 4, and 5 in an attempt to expedite prosecution (the previous Office Action had indicated the claims 10-12 and 17-20 were allowable over the art of record). Thus, claims 1, 4, and 5 are not currently pending in the present application. The Examiner's rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

Claims 10-12 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over AGGARWAL et al. in view of MIKI et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method of configuring a networking device. The method includes generating a first forwarding table; generating a second forwarding table; programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

conditions; and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions. AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al. do not disclose or suggest programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in a first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in a second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions. The Examiner admits that AGGARWAL et al. does not disclose these features (Office Action, pg. 4). The Examiner relies on col. 13, lines 17-36, of MIKI et al. for allegedly disclosing the above features of claim 10 (Office Action, pp. 4-5). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MIKI et al.

At col. 13, lines 11-36, MIKI et al. discloses:

When search key information is received from the multi-layer processing unit 21, the routing information retrieval unit 13 searches the routing information table 150 by using all of given search key items (input port number H62, input L2 identifier H63 and destination IP address H64) as search conditions in accordance with the flowchart shown in FIG. 9 (step S101). The routing information retrieval unit 13 checks the search result (S102). When there is a table entry matching the search conditions, the routing information retrieval unit 13 replies the output information OUT1 (forwarding type, output port number and output L2 identifier) of the table entry to the multi-layer processing unit 21 (S103). In the embodiment, in the table entry hit by the search conditions of the first stage, the forwarding type OUT11 indicates the MPLS core forwarding (POS-POS).

When the search at the first stage fails, the destination IP address H64 is used as a search key and the routing table 150 is again searched (S104). When the search result is checked (S105) and there is a table entry which matches the

search conditions, the output information OUT1 of the table entry (forwarding type, output port number and output L2 identifier) is returned to the multi-layer processing unit 21 (S103). In the embodiment, in the table entry hit by the search of the second stage, the forwarding type OUT11 indicates one of the MPLS edge-ingress forwarding, MPLS edge-egress forwarding, and IP forwarding.

This section of MIKI et al. discloses a first stage search where a routing information retrieval unit 13 searches a routing information table 150 using all of the search key information, which is described as an input port number, input identifier, and destination IP address (col. 13, lines 1-10). This section of MIKI et al. further discloses that when the first stage search fails, routing information retrieval unit 13 performs a second stage search by using the destination IP address as the search key to search routing information table 150 again. Thus, MIKI et al discloses searching the same routing information table in the first and second stages. This section of MIKI et al. in no way discloses or suggests programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in a first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in a second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions, as recited in claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit the claim 10 is patentable over AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10. Therefore, these claims are patentable over AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.²

Independent claim 17 recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features described above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 17 is patentable over AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Therefore, these claims are patentable over AGGARWAL et al. and MIKI et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to expedite prosecution of the present application.

² As Applicants' remarks with respect to the base independent claims are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections of all claims dependent therefrom, Applicants' silence as to the Examiner's assertions with respect to dependent claims is not a concession by Applicants to the Examiner's assertions as to these claims, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /John E. Harrity/
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: November 16, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44987